THE MILITANT

Published Twice a Month by the Communist League of America (Opposition)

VOL. IV, No. 1 NEW YORK, JANUARY 1, 1931 PRICE 5 CENTS

Fight Back the Boss' Offensive!

As the present world crisis grows in scope and intensity, gripping one industry after another furrowing its way to the very core of the complex capitalist structure, a good deal of ideological hardware undergoes a process of rapid corrosion. Not so long ago, "American" rationalization "scientific management" and the "technical revolution" were the inspiration of the entire capitalist world. This wave of enthusiasm undulated from the desperate Right wing of the bourgeoisie, the Fascists to its most servile Left, the Social Democrats, who pointed to America as the "workers' paradise".

Today when the super-capitalist Arcadia has blown up, with millions of workers pounding the pavements with an unprecedented tie-up in trade and an overloading of warehouses while countless families go unfed, unclothed and unprovided for—a different song is being sung. Capitalist spokesmen today speak with alarm of "technological unemployment", ask themselves "whether technical and managerial improvements do not cause unemployment after all," etc. A few simple figures tell the story:

Year	Vol. of Indus. Produc. Index	Vol. of Fact. Emp. Index.
1923	101	104.2
1924	95	96.2
1925	104	99.6
1926	108	101.4
1927	106	98.8
1928	111	97.2
1929	118	101.8

In the six years between 1923 and 1929 the index of production **rose** 17 points, the index of employment, at the same time **fell** 2.4 points! So striking is the contrast, so telling the consequences that even among the capitalists large number are seized with panic. Senator Wagner, for instance, quoting these figures before the Senate, concludes:

"Into every home that the problem of unemployment has entered it has brought with it a doubt as to **the validity of an economic system which permits such catastrophies to happen.** It is as yet only a doubt, but if we do not take the action that seems obvious and essential **that doubt will mature into an adverse conviction."**

Discounting the interplay of politics directed against the Hoover administration, the fear expressed and the concern with the problem of "technological unemployment" remains genuine nevertheless, and are doubtlessly shared by the capitalist class as a whole. What the Senator does not make clear is how the bosses intend to find an issue out of the straits imposed upon them by this crisis. Theoretically the bosses' plan of action has been voiced very clearly by one of the most prominent representatives of German capital, Dr. Friedrich Lemmer, in the **Deutsche Wirtschaftzeitung** of last February.

The Theory of Capitalist Offensive

"Rationalization" wrote Dr. Lemmer, "means substitution of labor costs . . . Since the productive apparatus is today overdeveloped . . . further progress in rationalization . . . is unthinkable." Invoking the "law of diminishing utility" he concludes that "rationalization becomes ever less and less profitable", and urges as an antidote to the ills of rationalization—a wage cutting drive all along the line.

This is the basic strategy of the bosses in the present crisis: to utilize the division of forces and the demoralization brought into the working class by unemployment in order to shift further the burden from their own shoulders by slashing the wages of the workers still in industry. This is their plan in Germany, this is their plan here and everywhere. In Germany the wage cutting campaign has already assumed huge proportions in the recent past. The strikes in Mansfeld, in the Northwest the recent Berlin metal workers' strike, were all part of the weak resistance organized by the treacherous reformists, which the campaign has swept aside.

In the United States, despite the fake industrial conefrence called by Hoover last year, despite the promises made by the bosses to "retain the high living standards of the workers" the wage cut drive, though still cloaked, has already made terrific inroads. Only Green and the high priests of the A. F. of L. have kept their part of the bargain, by doing their best to obstruct and prevent anything resembling a struggle on the part of the workers.

The Department of Labor announces alongside with a 2.5 percent drop in employment a **5.1 percent slump in payroll totals,** or **a 2.6 percent wage reduction for the month of November alone.** "Per capita earnings in manufacturing industries," the report reads, "in November 1930 were **3.5 percent lower than in October."** Still more serious are the general index figures for the entire year of November 1929 to November 1930:

	Employment	Pay-totals
Nov. 1929	94.8	95.1
Nov. 1930	76.5	68.5

While employment fell 18.3 points payroll totals dropped **fully 26.8 points.** A discrepancy which indicates the cut that the bosses have already made into the living standards of the American workers, and which reveals the seriousness that this trend will asume in the future.

Against this careful and well-planned offensive of the bourgeoisie only a solid and compact united front of the workers and jobless can be effective. Every step, in order to strike back must be organized on the broadest possible scale. If ever the slogans of the class struggle could be brought home to the American proletariat it is now.

But this cannot be accomplished by simply expecting the workers to rush to the revolutionary banner under the threat of being denounced as fascists or social-fascists but by going to the workers, by entering every mass organization in which they are to be found, by fighting for their support, by pointing out the way to them constantly and persistently. The only way to encounter the bosses' offensive now is by organizing the fighting defensive of the workers.

—SAM GORDON

«Order Prevails Throughout Spain»

Andres Nin, Leader of Spanish Left Opposition, Arrested and in Danger

The Madrid coup d'Etat attempted by the bourgeois republicans, headed by the aviator Franco, has been crushed by the Berenguer dictatorship without much difficulty. In Jaca, the attempted uprising has met with a similar fate. The iron fist has descended upon the militant labor organizations, their headquarters raided, their leaders arrested and imprisoned, and the strikes which were assuming a distinctly political character have been suppressed by violence.

The republican bourgeoisie, failing and fearing to rely upon the masses who alone can overthrow the monarchy and lead the revolution to a decisive conclusion, has made a pitiful debacle. One camp, further visioned and fearful of the mass movement of the workers that would be aroused by a popular insurrection has rallied to the decrepit monarchy of Alfonso and the brutal dictatorship of Berenguer. The other, equally contemptuous of the masses in whose name they pretend to speak, and whom they prefer to have act as soldiers obeying without thinking, has made the feeble and theatrical attempt to stage a novel revolt from the air which failed to inspire the masses to insurrection and was as ineffective as a spent rocket. The proletarian leadership of the revolution, which is still to be consolidated showed a fatal absence and unpreparedness.

An Unstable Dictatorship

The power of the Berenguer dictatorship, however, remains extremely tenuous. It was constituted on the pledge to restore those measures of "democracy" which the Primo de Rivera regime had so high-handedly abrogated. But the first step towards a loosening of the bonds, combined as it was with the accentuation of the economic crisis in the country, unleashed the dormant forces of the proletarian movement until acute strike struggles were raging from one end of the land to the other.

Harrassed on one side by the republican movement, on an other by the Catalonian separatists, on the third by the revivified labor movement, and in general by the popular dislike of the monarchy and the dictatorship, the Berenguer regime immediately showed that it was distinguished from its predecessor only by more militant violence. In the first important test of arms it has issued the victor. But it will be of brief duration if the forces maturing for new skirmishes and insurrections come to a head.

In the work of suppressing the revolutionary movement, even at its initial stage of political strikes against the dictatorship, the Berenguer regime has been able to rely—and how could it be otherwise?!—upon the warm support of the social democrats and reformist trade union leaders of the General Union of Workers. Like their brethren everywhere, they are in favor of violent revolution only in one country—the Soviet Union—but vigorously opposed to an insurrection against their own bourgeoisie. In all the important strikes that broke out after the fall of Primo de Rivera the Reformists played the servile game of scabs by fighting against the extension of strike aims beyond the narrow limits of a trade union struggle. Their kin in the ranks of the anarcho-syndicalists have ardently supported the other section of the bourgeoisie, the republicans. There is no reason at all to believe that there will be any change on their part in the coming struggles. The revolutionary situation has not been liquidated. The economic crisis has not been solved. The fighting moods of the workers have not been entirely dampened. The official Communist Party, characteristically enough with all its talk of the "third period", was caught entirely unawares by the events of recent weeks. It had been taught in recent months, under Manuilsky's tutelage, that a "partial strike" is of vaster import than a revolution of what he called the "Spanish type". The Left Opposition however, has been very active in the struggle, particularly in the Barcelona working class where it has considerable influence. A number of our most active comrades, including Pedro Lavid and others, have already been sentenced to imprisonment.

Further, we read the following alarming report in the Barcelona correspondence by the well-informed Jules Sauerwein to the New York **Times** of December 23 1930, who quotes Don Ignacio de Despujol captain-general of Catalonia.

"The result was an easy task when the disturbers began marching against the gendarmerie. There was no violence to speak of and we quickly arrested the ringleaders. **Among them was a notorious disciple of Trotsky** who spent a long time in Russia and is a Soviet agent here now."

Nin In Danger!

The reference is unmistakably to comrade Andres Nin, leader of the Spanish Opposition, and one of the principal founders of the Communist Party in Spain. For years, he was secretary of the Red International of Labor Unions. A steadfast supporter of the Opposition, this irreproachable rebel was finally expelled from the Soviet Union's borders a few months ago by the Stalinist apparatus. The bourgeois press has frequently reported concerning his activity in Barcelonia which he managed to reach after being expelled as a "counter-revolutionist" by the G. P. U. His arrest now means a serious blow to the whole labor and revolutionary movement. Every effort must be bent by the militants in all countries to force the release of comrade Nin and the other rebels imprisoned by the Berenguer dictatorship.

The Spanish revolutionists need the support of the international working class. Let us raise our voices in protest against the murderous work of the Spanish bourgeoisie which has already occupied a number of districts with the notorious Foreign Legion, composed of janissary scum of three continents, for the purpose of suppressing the workers' movement. The cause of Spanish labor is the cause of every worker. ——S.

Malkin Welcomed Back

A hundred workers, members and sympathizers of the Communist League and members of the Needle Trades Workers Industrial Union, gathered at Grand Central Station on December 20, to greet comrade Maurice L. Malkin upon his release from Comstock prison, where he served two years of the term to which he had been sentenced as one of the defendants in the Minecla frame-up. From the Station the comrades marched through the streets, singing revolutionary songs, until the headquarters of the Communist League at 84 East 10th Street were reached. An impromptu get-together was held, which gave way, later in the evening to a comradely gathering of dozens of workers to celebrate the release of Malkin and his return to the ranks of the active fighters for the Left wing in the trade unions and the Communist Opposition which he was one of the first to join.

The New York branch of the League has decided to hold a formal New Year's entertainment and dance to which all workers are invited to greet Malkin. It will be held on December 31, at the Militant Hall, 84 East 10th Street, when the New York Reds can get together for a hearty good time. Comrade Malkin will speak. The entertainment with music and dancing and eats, begins at 8 o'clock.

Comrade Kote Zinzadze's Life in Danger!

We have just received the following alarming report about our comrade Kote Zinzadze, a sterling Bolshevik fighter who was exiled by the Stalinist apparatus for supporting the struggle of the Opposition. For some time now he has been in a very dangerous condition, which we mentioned in a recent issue of the Militant. The report follows:

It is a month now that comrade Kote Zinzadze has been in a dying condition. In this time he has suffered two blood hemorrhages were accompanied by heart attacks, so that he was almost strangled. The doctors offer little hope for his recovery. The only hope of saving him, according to the doctors, is an absolute change of climate such as is offered by Suchum. The climate of Crimea where he is located, is fatal. Comrades have for a long time been endeavoring to obtain his transfer to Suchum. For two months, Ordjonikidze has promised to get the transfer for him, but so far no permit has been received . . . It will probably arrive when comrade Kote Zinzadze has died.

Danville Strike Prospects

A. F. of L. Leaders Prepare the Surrender of the Workers Struggle

After two months of heroic struggle, the strike of the 4,000 textile workers of Danville and Schoolfield, Va., is continuing militantly in spite of the "pacific" policy of the United Textile Workers. At the present the strike of the Virginia workers in the only major industrial conflict taking place in the United States and what it will lead to is of paramount importance to all workers, especially insofar as the future of the National Textile Workers Union is concerned.

A litle over a year ago, the N. T. W. U. lead the historic strike in Gastonia which we were told, was the beginning of a series of mighty struggles south of the Mason-Dixie line. At that time, the U. T. W. had a base only at Elizabethton, Tenn. and Marion, N. C. Today, it has support in many textile centers of the South while the N. T. W. U. is all but liquidated everywhere, including Gastonia.

The Danville workers are feeling the heavy club of the capitalist class just as their comrades did in Gastonia in 1929 in New Bedford in 1928 and in Passaic in 1926. Tear gas bombs are used to break up mass picket lines formed in spite of the reactionary U. T. W. leadership. Strikers to the number of 50 are arrested at one time and the National Guardsmen with glistening bayonets patrol the roads leading to the mill to prevent picketing.

When the U. T. W. protested to Gov. Pollard against the use of guardsmen to escort scabs to their homes, the governor referred the protest to Col. H. C. Opie of the National Guard for investigation and action. It so happens that Col. Opie is in command of the more than 500 guardsmen who are doing strike duty in Danville!

Recently three strikers were evicted from the company owned houses and similiar eviction notices were served on 47 of the most active strikers. When a protest was made to the governor he answered as follows:

"The 47 who were given eviction notices were known to be guilty of unfair and in many cases unlawful interference with the lawful right of other mill workers to work in the mill."

Most of the strikers live in the company owned houses and there is but little doubt that a wholesale eviction campaign will soon be started. At that time the crucial period of the strike will be reached, for the U. T. W. will not be willing to conduct a strike of such proportions that will result in evictions on a broad scale.

Policy Leads to Sell-Out

Already we have seen that the U. T. W. policy leads directly to a sell-out of the workers as took place in Elizabethton Marion and elsewhere. The futile appeals to Gov. Pollard who has shown clearly that he is an agent of the mill owners, is one telling example. The turning over of N. T. W. U. organizers to the police authorities in the early days of the strike in another. It is a clear indication that the strikers are greatly bewildered and do not know who are their real enemies. The strikers, who have in the past belonged to a company union are not so much to blame as the U. T. W. officialdom who in a critical period, can be depended upon to serve the mill owners and betray the interests of the workers.

The strike is the result of a 10 p c. wage cut given the workers last February. Altho the workers who all belonged to the company union, objected, nothing took place immediately. Later the United Textile Workers Union sent organizers into the field and on Sept. 29 called the strike.

In passing it may be asked: where was the N. T. W. U. all this time? According to the reports we have been reading in the **Daily Worker** for the last six months or more the South is honeycombed with N. T. W. U. organizers. Of course, we know that it is not true, and is printed in the Party press like so many other exaggerations to fool the Party membership and allow glowing reports to be sent to Moscow.

Only after the strike had been on for several weeks did the N. T. W. U. take notice of the situation and send down one man, Bill Murdoch, without any money or other resources. Before he was able to go he cooled his heels for several days in the corridor of the national office of the Party while Bedacht decided if money could be "spared" for that purpose. Bedacht told Murdoch to hike to Danville, to which Murdoch rejoined by asking Bedacht if he hikes when he goes on a tour for the national office. The whole situation brings up an interesting question: does the Party intend to keep the N. T. W. U. only as a decoration to issue an occasional statement in the Party press and send paper delegates representing nobody to the many "mass" conferences called by the Party, or does it intend to liquidate the organization and call for the building of a Left Wing the U. T. W.? According the present line it will not do the latter. Yet the Party is not doing anything seriously to develop the N. T. W. U. altho it calls it the organization of the mass of textile workers. It must not be allowed to become a mutual admiration society but a dynamic force for organizing the hundreds of thousands of unorganized textile workers in the South, New England and elsewhere. At the same time militant workers in the U. T. U. must be organized to fight against the McMahon regime and for the support of the Danville strikers.

N. T. W. U. Has Virtually Disappeared

In a series of articles contributed to the Militant in the last year, warning was given that unless the policy of the Party was changed the N. T. W. U. would virtually disappear from the scene. Events have more than justified the warning. Today practically no N. T. W. U. exists. The national office of the union is located in New Bedford where there is a membership of less than 200. A small group can be found in Paterson, N. J. and a sprinkling here and there. It is by no stretch of the imagination a **national** organization and unless immediate action is taken even the skeleton will disappear.

Once again we appeal to the militant workers in the N. T. W. U. to stop the ruinous policy of isolation and the suppression of those who do not accept the Stalinist program, and to rebuild the union on a broad basis. There is a big field in the United States for a militant textile union and there is no reason why the N. T. W. U. should not be that instrument. As its first task it should start a nation wide campaign for the support of the Danville strikers and a warning to the strikers against the ultimate betrayal by the U. T. W. The **Daily Worker** is strangely silent on the strike. Why?

—SYLVAN A. POLLACK.

IN ENGLISH IN GERMAN

"THE TURN IN THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL AND THE GERMAN SITUATION"

By Leon Trotsky

A penetrating examination of the displacements in the relationships of social forces evidenced by the recent elections in Germany the meaning of the sensational Fascist victory, its connection with the new policy of the Stalinist apparatus, and a proposal for action and perspective for the Communists. The edition, printed only a few weeks ago, is almost exhausted. Quick response will bring your copy immediately—in English or German, at the same price: 10 cents each or 7 cents in bundle order rates.

Order from
THE MILITANT
84 East 10th Street, New York, N. Y.

CACHIN'S FORTY YEARS OF SERVICE

"On the 18th of November," we are informed by the **Daily Worker**, "comrade Marcel Cachin, the leader of the French Communist Party, completed 40 years of activity in the service of the French and the international proletariat . . . **L'Humanite** published a special 'Marcel Cachin 40 Years Supplement'. Meetings, demonstrations and celebrations have been organized.

However much we might ordinarily refrain from breaking in rudely on a celebration, we should nevertheless like to ask: Are there included in the "40 years of activity in the service of the French and international proletariat" the services rendered by Cachin to French imperialism during the war, when he so warmly defended the bank accounts of the bourgeoisie, and their colonies; when he was sent to Italy to win the socialists there to the cause of the Allies; and other services of the same kidney?

Well, you interrupt impatiently, if you're going to mention that, why do you omit the leaders of other sections in the international Stalinist apparatus? What about Foster, leader of the American Party, and his unblemished record of Liberty Bond sales to make the world safe for democracy? Or Smeral, leader of the Czech Party, and his unremitting efforts to win the war for his beloved fatherland?

And try as we may, we can't think—as Ring Lardner would put it—of a comeback.

THE STRATEGY OF THE WORLD REVOLUTION

By LEON TROTSKY

A brilliant summary and analysis of the policies pursued since 1923 by the leading group in the Communist International on the most important problems confronting the revolutionary movement « « « An invaluable contribution to the issues of the day and an indispensable part of every worker's library » » »

One Hundred Pages

25 cents a copy :: in bundles 18 cents

ORDER FROM THE MILITANT, 84 E. 10th ST., NEW YORK, N. Y.

Militant Goes to New Headquasters

More room more light, more facilities, better location—that describes the new headquarters to which the office of the Communist League and the Militant have just moved. The new quarters are at 84 East 10th Street, between Third and Fourth Avenues, right on the first floor. The quarters we occupied previously at 25 Third Avenue proved to be too small for our purposes. In the new place, it will now be possible not only to have an efficient national office but also the local New York office. The technical equipment of the organization will also be there, and there is a large hall attached to the office which will permit the holding of regular branch and committee meetings, classes, and public forums.

In the process of moving, naturally, the expenditure of quite a sum was required. The local New York organization of the League after discussing the advantages of the new quarters, voted to share the expense of the moving. A number of comrades made special pledges which they have already paid, and it is largely to them that we are indebted. The contributors are as follows:

Nathan Berman, $25.00; Brown, $10.00; A. M. Glotzer, $10.00; M. Sterling $10.00; Morris Lewit, $10.00; Zipkin, $5.00; Phil Shulman, $5.00; Pauline Gutringer $3.00; Schwartz, $2.00; Sympathizer, $1.00.

In addition, after an appeal made by comrade Cannon at the public forum addressed two weeks ago in New York by Shactman, comrades and friends in the audience contributed a total of $14.00.

In the moving itself a number of comrades contributed invaluable assistance in carting over our furniture and equipment in the most economical manner. These included comrades Pete Hansen, Joe Friedman, Russ Blackwell, George Clarke, Jack Carmody, Sam Gordon, M. Morris. Many of them, including Paul Schwalbe, Max Engel and others, donated their services to arrange the new place in the best possible order.

A library and reading room is to be set up in the meeting hall to which Left wing and Communist workers are invited. Remember the new address: 84 East 10th St., New York N. Y.!

Our Open Forum

Ever increasing attendance is the feature of the most successful open forum series yet held by the New York branch of the Communist League. The last forum at which comrade James P. Cannon spoke on "Prospects for the American Revolution", we had the largest attendance yet: some 130 workers, who listened closely to the end and then stayed for questions to the speaker and discussion from the floor. One of the most significant sides of the forum is the increasing number of Party members who come to the meetings, participating through the questions and discussion in the most comradely manner. The plan of the New York branch in holding these meetings at the Labor Temple every Saturday night is to illuminate some current question from the viewpoint of the Left Opposition as well as to deal with the more fundamental questions that lie at the basis of the revolutionary movement. Comrade Max Shachtman, editor of the Militant, will speak on January 3, 1931 on "Alignments for the Next War". Unemployed presenting membership cards in their Council are admitted free.

WELCOME MALKIN!

New Year's Eve, Dec. 31st
at Militant Hall, 84 E. 10 St.

Music : : Entertainment : : Speaking
Comrade Malkin Will Recount His Prison Experiences
Admission: 35 c. All Invited

TH EMILITANT Vol. IV, No. 1 Jan. 1, 1931. Published twice monthly by the Communist League of America (Opposition) at 84 E. 10th St., New York N. Y. Subscription rate: $2.00 per year; foreign $250. Five cents per copy. Bundle rates 3 cents per copy. Editorial Board: Martin Abern, James P. Cannon Max Shactman, Maurice Spector Arne Swabeck. Entered as second class mail matter, November 28, 1928 at the Post Office at New York N. Y. under the act of March 3, 1879 (Total No. 60.)

Lovestone Prepares the Front with Musteism

By MAX SHACHTMAN

It is a bare two years ago that the Lovestone faction, then in control of the Party, combined with the present stratum of incompetents of the Foster group, to expell the Left Oppostion from the Party for demanding a discussion of those vital issues that lie at the bottom of the present struggle in the Communist movement. The principal weapons of the Lovestone faction then—as they are of the Foster faction today—were calumny and misrepresentation of our point of view, combined with the use of such powerful arguments as the blackjack, the thug's knife and the burglar's jimmy. Their later "change of heart", while it eliminated the more "powerful arguments" did not cause them to reject the "principled" weapons in their arsenal, and they have continued to use them to this day.

Lovstone's First Accusation

One of the main charges made against us by the Lovestone faction in the early days of our expulsion was that, aside from being the agents of world imperialism and counter-revolution, we were also the allies, or tools (every thesis worded it differently in conformity with the author's temperament) of the reformists of the Muste school, fighing against Communism and the Party, Lovestone, it will be remembered, was then advancing the brilliant postulate that the "Troskyists are the crassest expression of the Right danger", while he and his faction were the Old Guard Bolsheviks of the purest water. Idiotic as this sounds today (and it was no less idiotic when first formulated), it was seriously placed before the Party bureaucracy who just as solemnly voted nine to one that it was gospel truth.

We said and proved at that time that the Lovestone faction was the American representative of the International Right Wing that it was composed of corrupt opportunist leaders and apparatus men, the logic of whose position would compel them to go over further to the Right and end in the swamps of social reformism. As to our estimation of the "progressives", it was not affected by Lovestone's spurious cries about the "Trotsky-Muste alliance" any more than it is affected today by the hoarse shouts of the Browder-Foster-Bedacht combination. We established our point of view on the progressive movement and its leaders from the very beginning and have had no reason to change it to suit factional expediency, which was done, however, as has now become as clear as day by the Lovestone group. In the Militant of March 1, 1929, we said:

"The virtual abandonment of the old unions by the Communists, who have stood at the head of most of the opposition movements in the past five years, facilitates the emergence of the reformist group and affords the Socialists an opportunity to regain some of their lost positions. The new movement (i. e., the C. P. L. A.) is a challenge to the Communists for the leadership of the coming fights.

"These 'progressives' are weather-cocks who reflect certain winds blowing in the labor movement. Their emergence now with demands which connote militancy is an indicator of the radicalization of the workers growing within the old unions as well as in the ranks of the unorganized masses. **Their role, objectively speaking, is to express this radicalization in words, to harness it in action and to head it off from any real collision with the capitalists and the A. F. of L. machine."**

In our Platform, published February 15, 1929, we said further:

"The recent manifesto of the pseudo-progressive group of the **Labor Age** is primarily a reflection of this discontent in the ranks of the unions **which the reformists seek to divert into harmless channels.** The appearance of the new movement, even in a nebulous form with pseudo-progressives at its head, is a sign of the abdication of the Communists and the Left wing who in recent years have led these movements. The Party must penetrate every movement of opposition and revolt against the bureaucracy, forming united fronts with all honest progressive workers, **exposing the particularly deceptive and dangerous role of the pseudo-"Left" and pseudo-progressive leaders and struggling against them for the leadership of the opposition movements."**

Later in the same year, in the Militant of September 15, 1929, we continued to express the point of view we still hold to:

"Without the Communist leaven the new progressive movement will have no backbone. **It will retreat on all basic questions before the onslaught of the entrenched reactionaries and become a shield for them.** The movement **which Muste and similars seek to stultify** is a genuine movement from below. It has strength, it is growing and will continue to grow as the growing horror of capitalist rationalization drives discontent deeper into the ranks of the masses of the workers. Without asking anybody's permission the Communists must become a part of it influence it from within, push it to the Left and help to shape it into an effective fighting force. **Ruthless criticism of the Muste leadership is an indispensable part of this work for the future of the movement."**

How the Estimates Have Been Tested

The two years that have elapsed since our expulsion has afforded more than ample opportunity to test the validity of all the contentions in this question: Lovestone's and ours. The latter has been verified by a dozen experiences; the contemptible record of the MMuste adherents in the Illinois coal fields; their persistent genuflections before the A. F. of L. high priests in the textile field, particularly in the southern strikes; their respectable campaign on unemployment; their anti-Communist virulence which is backed up by the solid Socialist front of Oneal, Thomas and Co.; and so on and so forth. As to Lovestone's contentions concerning the "Trotsky-Muste alliance", they were put forward in cynical disregard of established facts, and were thrown overboard just as cynically and with just as little explanation. But for that, in striking confirmation of our evaluation of these Right wing adventurers the fantastic allegations of "unity" made against us have given way to the reality of unity between Lovestone and Muste—and worse. It is not the first time that such displacements have occurred in the struggle against the Left Opposition!

Lovestone's **formal** change of front, (formal, because it has been his view for a long time), comes simultaneously with the transformation of his paper into a weekly, which is to be the point of departure for a "deep participation in mass work". For the Right wing, this "participation in mass work" has always been expressed in the most disgraceful opportunist maneuvering and unity with any faker in the labor movement who was compelled to daub his cheeks with a spot of rouge in order to distract the attention of workers moving to the Left.

In recent years, this game has been played by the Right wing under the war cry against the Left of "Down with the sectarians". It was in the fight against "sectarianism" that the Chinese workers and peasants were finally put under Chiang Kai-Shek's iron heel; that the Communist Party was harnessed to the LaFollette-Fan Noli chariot so as to draw the petty bourgeoisie to power over the proletarian barriers; that the Communist lamb united with the Purcellian lion in the deadly comfort of the Anglo-Russion Committee. Incapable of working like Bolsheviks among the masses the Right wing fed the tendencies towards real sectarianism on the one hand, and of social reformism on the other. The same holds true of Lovestone's present "mass work" and "united fronts", which on the one hand give the Centrist sectarians demagogic arguments against a genuine united front of workers, and on the other hand, buttress the ramparts of reformism, Muste style.

Gitlow on the Progressives

The official announcement of the change comes in an article by Ben Gitlow entitled "Progressives and Left Wing" (**Revolutionary Age,** 12-13-1930.) To those who are at all acquainted with the Lovestone method of elaborating policies, it is evilent that the article is not a **beginning** but a **culmination.** That is to say it was written by agreement, for the record, and only **after** the preliminary negotiations had been held around the table with blinds drawn, between Lovestone and Muste.

In this article, Gitlow discovers, almost two years after the fact, that the official program of the Muste group "is acceptable to the Communists and the left wing in the trade unions." And if the matter were allowed to rest there, things might not be so bad. But Gitlow continues to evaluate the Muste group by what he writes and even more by what he carefully omits to write. As the prospective ally of Muste within the executive committee of the C. P. L. A., that is, as a prop from the Left for Muste's ax-grinding against the extreme Right wing of Oneal and Co., it is essential for Gitlow to utter a few well-chosen words of criticism. One is directed with one eye peeled for the Lovestoneite rank and file, at the "movement in general", in which its policies are gently chided being based on "faith in the bureaucracy." Lest anyone should misjudge this entirely loyal and well-intentioned "rebuke", Gitlow hastens to add: "It is the duty of the Communists in the trade unions to build up the Left wing forces in the unions so as to make possible a closer union and possibly an amalgamation of the genuine progressive forces of the Muste movement into the Left wing."

Since amalgamation is a rather serious affair, and assumes a closer political affinity than is required for a bloc we are entitled to know who are the "genuine progressive forces". Gitlow sheds illumination on this point with a heavy hand: "A definite break with the Socialist Party is inevitable just as soon as the progressives make a clean break with the bureaucracy. Such elements as James Oneal and J. B. S. Hardman (Salutzky), the errand boy of Sidney Hillman, have no place in a genuine progressive movement." By the process of eliminating these two elements, we arrive arithmetically at the "genuine progressives": Muste, Bright Budenz, Norman Thomas, Stanley, Hoelscher et tutti quanti.

Who Are The Mustes?

These are the people who play the same role in the American movement—with all due regard to proportions—as the Purcells and Cooks played in the British movement. When the workers move to the Right, they are indistinguishable from the open bureaucracy or else lie fallow and unneeded. When the workers move to the Left, they act as sieves straining all the militancy out of the workers' moods for struggle, preventing the full force of the workers from striking at the body proper of the labor lieutenants of the capitalist class. That they serve at the same time as a channel through which the workers express their discontent is also true, and does not change the fundamental fact of the function they perform. Their wordy radicalism is not costly and obligates them to nothing; it is cheap, considering how effectively if temporarily, it deceives workers into faith in Left social reformism and retards their development to Communism and revolutionary struggle. In every sense of the word, they are brakes on the Leftward movement of the workers.

Gitlow does not say a word about this. The whole article fails to utter a word of criticism or even to mention Muste at all, except for the incidental reference we have just quoted, because to all intents and purposes, the Lovestoneites have already "amalgamated" with the Muste section of the C. P. L. A.—amalgamated behind the scenes, by purely diplomatic negotiations at the top without incommoding explanations to the rank and file workers of the Right wing.

The Right wing, i. e., the liquidationist point of view on trade union work, which does not and cannot have anything in common with the revolutionary point of view is to strengthen this brake. It unites either integrally or in bloc with the Left reformists by putting the Communists under their command. If a bloc or united front with Left social democrats is necessary and tactically advisable—and very frequently it is, and should be made—it can only be done by rigidly maintaining the organizational and political independence of the revolutionists, by making temporary agreements even with the reformist leaders in order to set the workers in motion—but to set them in motion can be accomplished only by an incessant struggle against these leaders. Lovestone, following here the classic position of the Right wing under which the Stalin-Bucharin regime operated for years in their unity with the national bourgeoisie of China, the labor bureaucracy in England, and others, pursues a directly opposite path.

The Right wing is the principal instrument—whether it is conscious of it or not—of the forces opposed to revolution for the liquidation of the Communist movement, and its degradation to the position of the social democracy. The unprincipled merger with Muste and his associates is only a replica of what has happened with the Right wing groups in other countries. One need not be the seventh son of a seventh son to foretell the role the Lovestone group will play in the Muste movement. We have had a harbinger of the next future in the shady game the Right wing has just played in the International Ladies Garment Workers Union Local 1, New York. There the Lovestoneites made a united front to elect the notorious Louis Levy as local manager, the same Levy who expelled the Left wing workers from the union, and who now hypocritically poses as a "progressive" because Sigman, whose loyal henchman he has always been is at odds with the ruling section of the bureaucracy. Against Levy, the **Revolutionary Age** had not a single word of criticism to make, but on the contrary, practised a deliberate deception announcing in the first issue of its weekly "MILITANTS (!) WIN IN LOCAL 1". In other words the "mass work" and the "united fronts" of the Right wing consists of investing treacherous elements like Levy with the approbation of a revolutionary label. If so thoroughly discredited a type as Levy can find aid and comfort, even for a day, from Lovestone, why shouldn't Muste and Thomas expect at least as generous a deal?

Not the least characteristic phase of this whole situation is the manner in which the Lovestone leaders have consummated their plans. Their problem is indeed, no small one: to lead their membership into a merger with social reformists of the Levy or Muste stripe, to confront the workers in the Right wing camp with a blunt decision would never do for the Lovestone leaders, first, because it would be the honest way and second, it would shock them out of faith in the leadership. It must therefore be done gradually almost imperceptibly, by "enlightenment" while the arrangements have already been signed and sealed at the top.

Little by little, therefore, the tone of criticism of the Muste group is moderated, thinned down to a whisper. Yesterday's social reformists and weak-kneed pseudo-progressives become today, "militants" and "genuine progressives"; tomorrow they will be irreproachable comrades-in-arms. Yesterday, the Revolutionary Age, out of habit and regard to the membership, still spoke of Lore's **Volkszeitung** as "counter-revolutionary"; today, it isn't such a bad paper after all, especially when you recall that Lore is on the C. P. L. A. executive committee. Muste is brought down to the Lovestone open forum, not so much as an ideological opponent with whom to dispute, but to show the ranks that he is not half as black as he is painted (and Muste, it should be added in justice, delivered a speech which fitted this plan like a glove; he has his own troubles with Oneal and doesn't mind so harmless an ally as Lovestone). The idea is to put the thing over "in small doses", for it would be too hard for any worker trained in the Communist movement to swallow at one gulp.

In turning his face to " mass work", that is, to the role of chamberlains of the Left social democracy, Lovestone at the same time inevitably turns his back upon the Communist Party and the Left wing, that is, upon the bulk of the revolutionary movement in the country. The desire for a second party—hanging between social democracy and Communism—has been at the back of the Lovestone leaders' minds from the beginning. Naturally, the resistance of the Communist workers in the ranks is encountered here.

The first feeler is out now, in the person of Bert Miller, who accuses the leadership of "sectarianism", that is, of not going fast enough away from Communism. This is no faction fight; it is a division of labor. Miller demands an accelerated tempo and does it as clumsily as he always does everything else. Lovestone holds back so as to yield "reluctantly and under pressure" later on. That Miller is condemned, means little, if anything. It should be remembered that Lovestone took his followers out of the Party under a barrage of attack on Bedacht because the latter—scoundrel that he was!—favored affiliation to Brandler. While shouting at Bedacht, Lovestone led his followers into Brandler's camp—"skilfully" and by degrees. Miller today is Bedacht yesterday. An incidental figure himself he is nevertheless the dusk of Lovestone's twilight.

Bertram Wolfe, who has coined more luckless phrases than any other two men in the Right wing, once accused the Left Opposition of "travelling with express speed" away from Communism. We are not prepared to say at exactly what rate of speed the Right wing has moved away from Communism, in the last two years especially but it has become pretty plain that they are not impeded in their voyage by any heavy principled baggage. And the little they took along with them at the start cannot last long at the rate they are going.

What Next?

On the Campaign Against the Russian Right Wing

By the time this issue is off the press, the campaign against the Right wingers will probably have been completed by decisive organizational conclusions: the removal of Rykov, Tomsky and Bucharin from the Central Committee (perhaps Rykov only from the Political Bureau). Whether matters will come to the expulsion of the Right wing leaders from the Party and to their administrative punishment at the next stage, depends partly upon the conduct of the Right leaders* but primarily on the extent of the acuteness with which the Stalinist staff will feel the need of making a turn to the **Right.** For this is how matters now stand at the top. Just as the smashing of the Left Opposition at the Fifteenth Congress in December 1927 immediately preceded the Left turn, which officially opened on February 15, 1928, so the inevitable turn to the Right will have to be preceded by an organizational smashing of the Right Opposition. Why must it be preceded? Because if this turn should be made with the presence of the Rights in the Central Committee, the latter would declare their solidarity with the turn, and by that, would not only make their expulsion from the Party difficult but in general would additionally mar the perfection of the general line. But this is only one side of the matter. There is also another, no less important.

Who is to Be Responsible for the Past

Long before the decisive organizational crushing of the Left Opposition, a new split was being prepared in the bosom of the leading majority of that time, without which the turn to the Right could not even be thought of, not to speak of the fact that there would be nobody to blame for the Right wing course of yesterday. And now when the inevitable turn of the general line to the Right is being delineated on the horizon, one must presume, **a priori,** that a new split is taking shape in the ruling group which will be revealed only after the turn to the Right. It cannot be otherwise. For, on the one hand, not only in the Party—there is no need to speak of this—but even in the apparatus itself, there are elements who took the ultra-Left zigzag seriously as a systematic Left course: these elements will resist the approaching turn. On the other hand somebody has to bear the responsibility for the dizziness and for the turns on a State-wide scale. And one can even guess beforehand "theoretically" along what line the split will proceed, or more correctly has already proceeded, by applying the method of elimination. To attribute the excesses in industrialization and collectivization to Voroschilov and Kalinin, is impossible. For everybody knows well enough where the sympathies of these two **captives** of the Left zig-zag are directed. To attribute the responsibility for the political dizziness to Kuibischev, Dudzutak or Mikoyan, is impossible, because here too, nobody would believe it: for political dizziness something akin to a political head is required. Thus there remains only one—Molotov.

The conclusion arrived at by the method of elimination is substantiated by several Moscow sources. We are informed that, for a considerable time Stalin has been very diligently spreading rumors through various channels that Molotov has become conceited, and that he is always obedient, and interferes with him, Stalin, in conducting a completely infallible "general line" pulling at his coat-sleeves from the Left. The mechanics of the new zigzag are thus clear in advance because they reproduce the past we already know. But there is also a difference which consists of **revealing the mechanics** and **accelerating their tempo.** An ever greater number of people know how it is done and by what phrases it is covered. It is becoming clear to ever broader circles of the Party that the basic source of two-handedness is the general secretariat, which systematically deceives the Party: it says one thing and does another. An ever greater number of people come to the conclusion that Stalin's leadership is too costly to the Party. Thus, in the mechanics of the Centrist zig-zags and the apparatus crushing, a moment arrives when quantity has to be converted into quality.

The Soviet and Party bureaucracy raised Stalin on the wave of reaction against the October revolution, against War Communism against the convulsions and dangers rooted in the policy of international revolution. In this lies the secret of Stalin's victory. Beginning with 1924, new generations were being reared, and the old ones were being re-educated in the spirit of the theoretical and political reaction of a national-reformist character. Stalin's "Left" reservations—reservations of a cautious Centrist—did not interest anybody. What entered the consciousness was: quietly, bit by bit we will build up socialism without any revolutions in the West; one must not skip over stages; the slower you go—the further you get; why not conclude a bloc with Chiang Kai-Shek, Purcell, Raditch? Why not sign the Kellogg Pact? (Even a piece of string may come in handy on a trip) And above everything—down with the "permanent revolution"—not the theory, with which the majority of the bureaucrats are not in the least concerned, but the international revolutionary policy with its disturbance and risks, when here in the U. S. S. R., there is something real at hand.

This is the philosophy upon which was reared the Stalinist apparatus, numbering millions of people. The majority of the real Stalinist bureaucracy feels deceived by its leader since 1928. "A peaceful growing over" of the October regime into a national state capitalism did not—and could not take place. Coming to the edge of the capitalist precipice Stalin—even though he is no lover of jumps—made a breakneck jump to the Left. The economic contradictions, the dissatisfaction of the masses, the tireless criticism of the Left Opposition, compelled Stalin to make this turn in spite of the partly active and primarily passive resistance of the majority of the apparatus. The turn took place with a gnashing of the teeth of the majority of the bureaucrats. This is the most direct reason why the new stage of "monolithism" was accompanied by an open and cynical establishment of the plebiscitary-personal regime. Only by utilizing its last inerita can Stalin still carry out the smashing of the Rights and also the new turn which will cost him immeasurably more than all the preceding ones.

About a year ago we said that a new squeak is being heard in the apparatus. Since then the squeak has become a clatter. What import has the fact that Syrzov, placed in a high post for the purpose of easing out Rykov, turned out to be the head of the socalled "two-handed", that is people who vote officially for Stalin, but think, and if they can also act differently. How many such Syrzovs are there in the apparatus? Alas, these statistics are inaccesible to Stalin. They can be revealed only in action. The official press characterizes Syrzov as a Right winger. The fast that Syrzov sought a bloc with the Left- Centrists of the type of Lominadze and Schatzkin not only marks an extraordinary confusion in the ranks of the apparatus but also shows that Syrzov is one of those disorientated Right wing apparatus men who have, however, become frightened at the Thermidor.

The Faction of Toadies

There are also others. They are those who vote against Syrzov and Lominadze demand the expulsion of Rykov and Bucharin, swear fealty to the only and beloved leader, and at the same time think a deep thought: how to betray to the best advantage. These are the Agabekova and others. The toadies of the revolution, its bureaucratic flunkeys, have succeeded in showing themselves sufficiently in foreign countries. Jumping over the fence, they soon sell themselves to the new boss. How many of them are in the Soviet apparatus inside the country? It is harder to count them than to count the frightened Rights and the honestly confused Centrists. But there are many of them. Stalin's successes, with all his zig-zags systematically settled down in the apparatus in the form of a faction of toadies, who remained devoted "without adulation" even five minutes before complete betrayal. For any kind of independent political, and what is more, historical role this human abomination is absolutely incapable. But it can well play the role of a banana peel upon which the plebiscitary perfection of Stalin will slip.

Once slipping, the Stalinist apparatus will no longer find its previous balance. It has no support of its own under its feet. Will it find support to the Right? No. Two sectors are there: confused and even despairing opportunists, incapable of any initiative, and bureaucratic flunkeys capable only of initiative for betrayal. At the Right, the Centrist elements will find no support. And at the Left? Only here, from the Left wing is it possible to repel the Thermidorian-Bonapartist danger, aggravated by the policy of the Centrists. Does this mean a bloc with Stalin? The struggle of the Bolsheviks against Kornilov who directly attacked the Provisional Government—was that a bloc with Kerensky? In the face of direct counter-revolutionary danger, a common struggle with that part of the Stalinists which will not prove to be on the other side of the barricades, is self-understood.

But this is not the main question. The moment the apparatus split by contradictions and falsehoods, begins to rock, the situation can be saved not by any parts or particles of the apparatus itself but by the Party, the vanguard of the proletariat. Here is the task! Meanwhile the Party as an organizational whole is non-existent. The accumulation of flunkeys in the apparatus has meant the destruction of Bolshevism and the Party. In this lies the historical crime of Stalin. But the elements of the Bolshevik Party are extraordinarily numerous, alive and indestructible. No matter how much the apparatus should strive to set them by their ears, the worker-Bolsheviks draw their own conclusions from heavy lessons. Tens of thousands of old Bolsheviks, hundreds of thousands of young potential Bolsheviks will arise in the moment of danger. The bourgeois restoration which will attempt to stretch out its hand towards power will be left without hands.

The Task of the Opposition

The Left Opposition is the vanguard of the vanguard. In relation to the official Party the same qualities and methods are demanded of it which under normal conditions are required of the Party in relation to the class: an unwavering principled hardness, and at the same time a readiness to move together with the masses, even the smallest step ahead.

In the Party, the voice of alarm must be raised in the nearest future. The Party must begin to find itself. This is inevitable. It flows from the whole situation. By what road will this process go forward? It is impossible to foretell. But matters will come to a deep internal realignment, that is, to the selection and welding together of the real revolutionary proletarian Party from the human dust trampled underfoot by the apparatus.

In the face of the sharp convulsions and acute changes in the situation, it would be doctrinary to bind oneself beforehand by any sort of partial unprincipled organizational-technical slogans to which the slogan of a coalition Central Committee is partially related. We wrote on this subject several weeks ago, on the eve of the last campaign against the Rights. Since then much has changed. But we think even now, that the slogan of a coalition Central Committee may appear to the broad circles of the Party as the only one capable of finding a way out of the chaos. It is understood that the coalition Central Committee in itself would not solve anything; but it could make it easier for the Party to solve the tasks before it, giving it the possibility to find itself with the least possible convulsions. Without a deep internal struggle this is no longer possible; but we must do everything to exclude from this internal struggle a great service to the Party in the most critical moment. It is not the Bolshevik-Leninists who will assist such an agreement. But making it they can now less than ever before, renounce their traditions and their Platform. We must say outright: there is no other banner at present!

* Bucharin has repeated another rite of repentance. The others will probably follow after him. Very little of the nature of things will be changed by this. But the character and the order of administrative punishment may turn out to be different. There is no need of saying that our policy does not in the least depend on the waverings within the framework of the apparatus autonomy as a whole.

N. Y. OPEN FORUM

EVERY SATURDAY NIGHT
at the Labor Temple
14th Street and Second Avenue

JANUARY 3. ALIGNMENTS FOR THE NEXT WAR

—Max Shachtman.

How close is the next world war? What will be the line-up of the imperialist powers? What role will the United States play in it? What will be its effect on the Soviet Union? These are some of the points that will be discussed at the lecture.

Admission 25c **Come Early**

Unemployed admitted free upon presentation of Unemployed Council card.
Auspices: New York branch of the Communist League of America (Opposition).

The Red Fleet Visits Greece

We have received the following letter from our comrades of the Greek Opposition:

"The Red Fleet of the Black Sea arrived at Phalerus on October 11; it remained there until the 14th. We profited by the occasion to distribute Oppositionist leaflets in Russian among the sailors. A group of 50 comrades, supplied with these leaflets, endeavored to board the ships. Our comrades approached the Soviet ships in boats to the tune of the International, but the Fleet Commander issued the order to prevent them from boarding. A package of leaflets was then thrown aboard the "Tcheraonetz Ukrainy." The officers of this ship prohibited the sailors from reading them and threw them into the sea.

"About a hundred comrades on the Phalerus shore threw leaflets into the motorboats that bore the sailors. The police arrested three comrades, but the distribution of leaflets to the sailors and workers of the port (in Greek) continues nevertheless.

"Other groups, scattered in the streets of Athens and Piraeus, especially in the sections visited by the sailors (the Acropolis, museums, etc.,) conducted the same work. In spite of the prohibition by the officers, more than 100 sailors took the leaflets. Many of them showed a live sympathy which they tried to conceal before the officers."

In this leaflet, our Greek comrades explain to the Soviet sailors the real situation in the Greek Communist Party and the whole international Communist movement. They point out the internal and external dangers threatening the U. S. S. R. and vow to defend with all their might the U. S. S. R., and the October revolution. They invite the Red sailors to speak out against the errors and crimes of Stalin "who deports Rakovsky and puts Bessedovsky in his place; who shoots the Left Oppositionist Blumkin and replaces him with the traitor Agabekov."

It is very characteristic that the sailors received the leaflets with sympathy, while the Red Fleet Commander prohibited the workers who sang the International from getting aboard.

Our comrades of the Greek Opposition fraternized with the worker-sailors of the Red Fleet. Their example should be followed everywhere by Oppositions who have the opportunity of making contact with the sailors of the proletarian country.

o—o—o

HOW STALIN FOUGHT BLOOD-LETTING

In the concluding remarks on the political report to the Fourteenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, (1925), Stalin declared:

"The Leningrad Provincial Committee passed a resolution demanding the expulsion of comrade Trotsky. We, that is to say, the majority of the Central Committee, were not in favor of such a step. ('Quite right!') After a struggle, we were able to persuade the Leningrad comrades to delete the sentence about expulsion from their resolution. A little later, when the plenum of the Central Committee met, the Leningrad members, supported by comrade Kamenev, proposed the immediate exclusion of comrade Trotsky from the Political Bureau. We could not accept this proposal of the opposition either. We were in a majority on the Central Committee, and were content to remove comrade Trotsky from his position as people's commissary for war. We did not agree with comrades Zinoviev and Kamenev, for we knew that the policy of lopping-off might entail grave dangers for the Party. The method of lopping-off, the method of blood-letting (it was blood-letting they wanted) is dangerous, and infectious. Today, you lop off one limb; tomorrow, another, the day after tomorrow, a third—and what is left of the Party?" (Applause).

o—o—o

IN THE NEXT ISSUE!

This issue has been considerably delayed because of the difficulties entailed by moving from our old headquarters to the new. In addition, the Militant has been compelled to omit a considerable amount of material of importance, for lack of space. Next issue will contain among other other things an article analyzing the thesis of the recent Plenum of the Party Central Committee, an article on the Bank of the United States crash and the Party's policy of organizing the shop-keeper depositors a review of the recent events in China, an article by comrade Trotsky on Thermidorianism and Bonapartism etc., etc.

What Is to Be Learned from the Moscow Trial?

The act of indictment in the case of the sabotagers' center (the "Industrial Party") is of exceptional interest, not only because of its directly political significance but also from the point of view of the struggle of the tendencies within the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The Opposition asserted and repeated in all of its documents that the minimalist provisions of 1923-1928 in the sphere of industrialization and collectivization were dictated on the one hand by the Kulak, and on the other—by the foreign bourgeoisie, through the medium of the Soviet bureaucracy.

The leading Soviet specialists, called to responsibility, show what an intensive struggle they developed in the past for the minimalist program in the Five Year Plan. Thus, it is pointed out by Ramzin particularly the most important measure of the sabotagers in relation to all the basic branches of industry was "the slowing down of the tempo of development, which is particularly clear in the old Five Year Plan, worked out under the influence of the Center," (that is, the center of the sabotagers).

The Opposition and the Five Year Plan

The old Five Year Plan, in its day, was submitted to the most crushing criticism by the Opposition. It is sufficient to quote from the Platform its general evaluation of the first Five Year Plan of Stalin-Ramzin: "The gigantic advantages of the nationalization of land, the means of production, banks, and centralized direction, that is, the advantages of the socialist revolution, are not all reflected in the Five Year Plan." (Page 30.) The Central Committee declared our criticism of the Five Year Plan to be of an anti-Party nature. The Fifteenth Party Congress declared that we lack faith, because we became "frightened" of the allegedly unavoidable decline in tempo of the reconstruction period. In other words, during 1923-1928, that is, in the period of the development of the struggle against the Left Opposition, the Central Committee was the unconscious political instrument of the specialist sabotagers who, in turn, were the hired agents of the foreign imperialists and the Russian emigrant compradores. But didn't we always assert that in the struggle against the Left Opposition, Stalin is fulfilling the social command of the world bourgeoisie and disarming the proletarian vanguard? What were once sociological generalizations are now strengthened by irrefutable juridical proof in the act of indictment.

Intensity is the heart of the Five Year Plan. On the beating of the heart depends the life of the whole organism. But who were the ones to determine the rhythm of the heart itself? Ramzin makes a very precise reply to this:

"The execution of the basic provisions of the Industrial Party (that is, the party of the sabotagers) in the sphere of intensity was assured by the fact that **the basic organs deciding the given question were wholly in the hands of the Industrial Party."**

This is who directed the Stalinist struggle for a number of years against the "super-industrialists"!

What the Sabotagers Aimed At

Is it not clear that the act of indictment of Krylenko against the Industrial Party is at the same time an indictment of the Stalinist upper layer, which, in its struggle against the Bolshevik-Leninists was really the political weapon of world capitalism? But the matter did not end with the old Five Year Plan. The same defendants show that "beginning with the second half of 1928"—observe the exactitude of the division into two periods!—"a continued reliance upon the slowing up of the tempo became impossible because," as Ramzin says, "of the energetic execution in life of the general line of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union." The second half of 1928—is just the time when the Central Committee turned down the Five Year Plan for a criticism of which Oppositionists were sent to Siberia. However, did the Sabotage of the specialists cease since 1928? No, from this time onward it was particularly strengthened in view of the expectation of istervention, but in the words of the same Ramzin, it took on a different character: "The basic measures in the sphere of industrialization"—he shows—"were supposed to be directed towards the **deepening** of the economic difficulties, unavoidable in any case."

But here Ramzin does not speak out entirely, or else Krylenko does not quote Ramzin's evidence to the end. In spite of this, the matter is quite clear. The method of the specialists working under the direction of Krzhyzhanovsky consisted of "deepening the economic difficulties", that is, of strengthening the disproportion of different branches of industry and of economy as a whole. Since, beginning with the second half of 1928, this aim could not be accomplished by a slowing down of tempo, the opposite road remained: an **excessive** acceleration of tempo of individual branches of industry. It is quite evident that one method is just as effective as the other.

In this way, we get what may appear to be an unexpected, but in reality a quite natural, explanation of how and why the State Planning Commission, in which the sabotagers were the basic kernel and where they led their "superior" Krzhyzhanovsky by the nose without difficulty, so easily passed from minimalist to maximalist tempos, and without any resistance sanctioned the conversion of the unverified Five Year Plan into a four year plan. The specialists understood perfectly that the unbridled acceleration of individual branches of industry without verification, without foresight, without capable regulation, results, on the one hand, in a disproportion and, on the other hand, lowers the quality of production, in this manner preparing the explosion of the Five Year Plan at its succeeding stage. In this way it flows without the least doubt from the act of indictment that in the period of its economic lagging—up to 1928—as well as in the period of its economic adventurism—beginning with the second half of 1928—the Stalinist economic leadership acted under the dictation of the sabotagers' center, that is, a gang of agents of international capital. For the struggle against this "leadership", the Bolshevik-Leninists were put in jail, exiled and even shot. Here is the naked truth which cannot be refuted by any shrewd concoction!

Pravda and the Planning Commission

The act of indictment, revealing the picture of the sabotagers' command of the State Planning Commission and in the All-Union Council of People's Economy, is published in the November 11th issue of **Pravda,** and a day before, the same paper, in a feuilleton under the extraordinarily fresh title: "Merciless Fire against the Right-Left Bloc", writes the following with regard to the snares of the Opposition:

"And this means the usual factional trick: by attacking, let us say, the **State Planning Commission** and the control figures for the 'bureaucratism of the economic organs'—they conduct an attack upon the Central Committee, upon the policies of the Party and the Party leadership."

This quotation seems absolutely incredible. A criticism of the State Planning Commission, for a number of years a toy in the hands of the bourgeois wreckers is made identical by **Pravda** with a criticism of the Central Committee and by that alone is declared to be blasphemy. Didn't somebody play a "trick" here on **Pravda** itself? And in the approaching crisis we will find out from the second act of indictment that the Stalinist super-tempos, against which we issued a timely warning, were ordered from the sabotagers by the compradores. Such is the logic of the Stalinist regime!—L. T.

Imperialist Gunpowder in the Air :: By Paul Sizoff

PARIS—

A wind of panic seems to have swept over the French bourgeoisie since the last speech of Mussolini. From the perpetual revenge-mongers of the **Echo de Paris** to the "Pacifists" of the sacred union of **Populaire,** all are talking of the coming war. The former are rubbing their hands: an excellent opportunity for them to militarize the country a little more, to squander new billions in order to satisfy the appetites of the munitions dealers who pull them on their strings. As to the latter, they profit by refurnishing their pacifist armor, greatly discolored by years of social-patriotism; they launch themselves upon the country demanding peace and disarmament through merciless struggle against nationalism and Bolshevism.

After the Versailles Peace

The victorious imperialist state which has least profited from the Versailles peace is incontestably Italy. The treaty gave her neither sources of raw material nor markets, the two poles of capitalist production. Kept out of Africa by France and England which had carved themselves the lion's share there, the dismemberment of the Austro-Hungarian Empire had no other result than that of favoring the vassals of French capitalism—Jugo-Slavia, Roumania, Czecho-Slovakia, which defend themselves behind their tariff walls against Italian penetration. In this chiefly agricultural country, Italian capitalism has no internal market because of the extreme misery of the peasant masses; it has no external market in the midst of the world crisis of over-production. The trade balance reaches a deficit of six billion francs but Italian capitalism has not as much exported capital as its French or English neighbors to offset its passive trade balance.

On the contrary, it is only by repeated loans from the United States that Fascism has been able to develop and to rationalize its industry. The lowest wages in Europe and unemployment are the ransom that Italian and American capitalists extort from the toiling masses crushed by the Fascist terror.

The economic situation is so tragic, the Fascist power so distrustful of its political future, that Mussolini, while reenforcing his anti-working class terror, plans to recruit collaborators from the former parliamentary ministers of the Giolitti government.

This is the moment that Mussolini chose to make his loud voice heard over Europe. By his threats and by his war-music he seeks to restore the inner cohesion of Fascism, undermined by its contradictions, he hopes to group the vanquished powers and Bulgaria in a united front of resistance to French hegemony. The bourgeois press is pleased to compare his attitude with that of William II before the war. And that serves as a pretext for the nationalist crowd to increase armaments. However, there is nothing in common between the Germany of 1914 and the Italy of 1930.

1914 and 1930

Germany in 1914 was the foremost industrial power in Europe with a considerable productive capacity, a highly developed technique and the greatest army and the second navy in the world. Finally, she had, as did her French and English foes an unprecedented accumulation of capital—**the sinews of war.** This abundance of capital was the result of long years of prosperity, interrupted only by periodical crises which appeared over Europe and from the point of view of economics, the war replaced this crisis. If it has massacred millions of men it has also destroyed billions in capital at the same time, and ruined and impoverished the majority of the European countries, transforming creditor nations into debtors. The war served as a safety-valve for capitalist over-production, but it was possibe only due to that superabundance. The Italy of 1930 is suffering from the world crisis more severely than most of the greater capitalist countries. She has not England's reserves nor Germany's technique. Her war fleet, her only guarantee in case of war, amounts to no more than three-fifths of the French fleet. Her capital reserves are very weak and the crisis consumes them more and more every month. That is moreover, the common feature of imperialist war and the crisis of overproduction. Both are on a world scale, both destroy some capital and while the one massacres the proletariat, the other condemns it to a slower death. Italy would not be able to sustain an imperialist war except insofar as she will be aided by a powerful imperialism, that is Yankee imperialism.

The Role of America

The crisis is also shaking American capitalism and its attitude at the London Naval conference shows clearly that in the present situation it is interested in preserving a conciliatory attitude on the military terrain. A course towards armament at this time would be very unwelcome to the American bourgeoisie (excepting the clique which gravitates around Hearst), and Hoover attached great importance to the ratification of the naval accords, an importance which he has underlined in a recent speech. The American press rails at the pretensions of Mussolini and compares them with the feeble means at his disposal. Gibson the American delegate at the disarmament conference went to Rome to remind the Fascist government of its dependence upon American capital. The Washington government is anxious to obtain a temporary Franco-Italian accord which will permit it to put the Treaty of London into application the treaty which, as we have frequently emphasized, actually consecrates the naval supremacy of the United States.

As the banker of Italy and as an imperialist power of the first order, it does not want to steer into an international conflict in which it would necessarily be embroiled. Especially in the present state of the crisis in which its own economy is involved.

The Real Danger

War does not depend upon the political form assumed by the bourgeois state, but on the real economic and military relationship of forces. Hitler and Mussolini are not dangerous because of their nationalist bravado but because they represent the physical destruction of the proletariat, its economic and political subjugation to the most ferocious exploitation of the bourgeoisie. They are dangerous because they represent concretely the desire of the bourgeoisie to solve the crisis on the backs of the proletariat.

The proletariat must fight them to the death; not because they want the revision of the Versailles Treaty, but because they are the bloody rampart of capitalism in distress. The Versailles Treaty will be much more surely destroyed by the proletarian revolution than by the parades of Hitler and Mussolini. It will be suppression with the suppression of the capitalist class, whether it calls itself Mussolini or Tardieu Hitler or MacDonald.

Without attaching too much importance to the phrases of Mussolini, it is true that war, without being **probably** imminent, is a perpetual menace of capitalist society. This menace will become more precise according as certain big capitalist powers are able to disentangle themselves from the crisis and enrich themselves at the expense of the others. For this competition France occupies the foremost place. She abounds in gold and in capital; she abounds in soldiers, in cannon and in airplanes; she abounds in allies who are the police of Europe. The fortifications of Tardieu have a firmness quite different from the bellicose speeches of the nationalist agitators. By its existence alone in the midst of a ruined Europe, of a shaken world, she constitutes a genuine danger of war.

The French Communists do not have to fight directly against Hitler, they must precipitate the defeat of their own bourgeoisie, of their own government before its dream of hegemony finds its realization in a bloody venture.

o—o—o

A VERY OBLIGING REPLY

An Associated Press dispatch of December 8 reprinted in numerous papers including th New York Evening **Post,** gives the following bit of instructive information:

"Mr. Henderson (British Foreign Secretary), despite heckling as to whether he intended to permit the case to rest in the present state, deferred his answer the protest against a recent broadcast in English from Moscow in which miners were urged to resist the owners' terms. The broadcast had been made by a trade union station over which the Soviet Government has no control, the message explained.

"However, it continued that 'taking into consideration Foreign Secretary Henderson's declaration of the undesirability of such broadcasts, in the future it will be impressed on the Union of Central Councils that no such messages should be transmitted'."

Henderson the Labor minister considers messages to the British miners urging resistance to the capitalist offensive as "undesirable", while Stalin promises to impress the Russian trade unions not to send such messages again. There are such things, under certain conditions as good agreements with reformists, but Stalin seems to have the sorry knack of always making bad ones.

If the number on your wrapper is

60

then your subscription to the **Militant** has expired. Renew immediately in order to avoid missing any issues.

The Bloc of the Left and the Right

By LEON TROTSKY

Revealing the real or fictitious bloc of Syrzov with Lominadze as a bloc of the Right and "Left" (?) elements, **Pravda** repeats: "We have already witnessed such unprincipled blocs many times, beginning with the **August** bloc." That the August bloc, calculated to reconcile the Bolsheviks with the Mensheviks, was a mistake, is irrefutable. But this took place in 1913 for a period of two or three months—since then much water has passed under the bridge.

But Stalin, in March 1917, on the eve of Lenin's arrival, advocated a fusion of the Bolshevik Party with that of Tseretelli. Under the influence of Stalin and his like, the majority of the social democratic organizations during the February revolution had a united character, that is, they consisted of the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks. In such proletarian centers as Ekaterinburg, Perm, Tula, Nizhni-Novgorod, Sermovo, Kolomna, Yusovka, the Bolsheviks separated from the Mensheviks only at the end of May 1917. In Odessa, Nikolaev, Elizavetgrad, Poltava, and other points in the Ukraine, the Bolsheviks did not have any independent organization as late as the middle of June 1917. In Baku, Zlatousto, Bezhitsko, Kostroma, the Bolsheviks split decisively from the Mensheviks at the end of June. Is it in place here to recall the August bloc of 1913?

Stalin and the Bloc with the Right

But there is no need to look back to Stalin's position in 1917. The fictitious Lefts (Lominadze, Schatzkin, etc.), who are really Centrists in despair, are accused of a bloc with Bucharin, Rykov and Tomsky. They see Bucharin's chief guilt—and correctly so—in his advocacy of the Kulak growing into socialism. But it is precisely for the exposure of this theory and the practice flowing from it, that the Opposition was expelled from the Party. **And Stalin was in a bloc with Bucharin and Rykov** against the Left Opposition—not for two or three months, but for eight years—precisely at the time when Bucharin developed the theory of the Kulak growing into socialism, when Rykov relied on the backward village and resisted industrialization. On whose part, then, was there a bloc with the Rights? Lominadze, Schatzkin, Sten and others are put forward as Lefts, "Trotskyists" and "semi-Trotskyists". All of them, however, in a bloc with Stalin wrote into the history of the struggle against Trotskyism a not very glorious but unusually lucid page. Are they really in a bloc with the Right? In what is this bloc expressed? What is its program? The Party knows nothing about it. The shamelessness of **Pravda** in inner-Party falsifications is unexampled, and has its source in the days of Bucharin. **Pravda** dresses up some as Lefts, others as Rights, combines the ones with the others—it has a free (alas, illiterate) hand in everything. But the Party is unable to verify any of it.

The attempt to base the legend of a bloc of the Left Opposition with the Right on ideological considerations and not only on new revelations of the G. P. U., has a very sorry and unwise appearance.

The Problem of the Regime

In the first place, says the Stalinist press, the Rights as well as the "Trotskyists" are not satisfied with the regime and accuse it of bureaucratism. As if, by the way, anybody in the world could be satisfied with the regime of spurious plebiscites and inevitable double-handedness which grows with just as insurmountable a force as the isolation of the Stalinist top from the Party and the working class. As for us, Bolsheviks-Leninists, we never looked upon Party democracy as freedom for Thermidorian views and tendencies. Party democracy, on the contrary, was trampled underfoot in the defense of the latter. By the restoration of Party democracy we understand the conquest by the real revolutionary proletarian core of the Party of the possibility to curb the bureaucracy and really to purge the Party, to purge the Party of Thermidorians in principle as well as of the unprincipled and careerist brethren who vote according to the command from above; not only from the tendencies of **chvostism** but also from the numerous factions of flunkeyism, whose name should not be derived from Greek or Latin but from the truly Russion word for flunkey in its contemporary, bureaucratized and Stalinized form. This is only we need democracy!!

The Rights have suddenly come to need democracy in order to have the possibility to conduct a consistently opportunist policy which irritates all the classes and disorganizes the Party. But a consistently Right wing policy, no matter what the intentions of Bucharin, Rykov and Tomsky may be, is the policy of Thermidor. Where is the ground here for a bloc, or even the shadow of a bloc?

But, says the Stalinist press, the Left Opposition is "against" the Five Year Plan in four years and "against" complete collectivization.

Stalin's Juggling of Figures

Yes, the Left Opposition has not experienced the dizziness which is inevitable for the Centrist bureaucracy that has made a turn of 180 degrees. When the Party press, in the spring of this year, blew the trumpets about a sixty percent collectivization of the peasantry, we exposed this nonsense, self-deceit and deception—before the dizziness was attested to by the responsible director of the zig-zag. Stalin very soon made a rebate of twenty percent, expressing the hope that forty percent of the peasants would remain in the collective farms. **Pravda** of very recent date writes that indvidual farms embrace three-fourths of the peasantry, so that to the share of the collective and Soviet farms are attributed only twenty-five percent. We see how shaky are all these data, and how, by one stroke of the pen, tens of millions of peasants are thrown from the camp of socialism into the camp of petty bourgeois commodity production, which nourishes capitalism.

If the turn back from the general line consists of 140 percent (25 percent of those who are now supposed to be in the collectives are what is left of the 60 percent who were driven out of them!) then it is clear that in the place of the 140 percent turn there is room for a Left and a Right, not to speak of Stalin himself who came out against the maximalism of his own faction after the fact.

But no matter how many peasants are actually collectivized now, twenty, twenty-five or thirty percent, we do not consider this sector, as a whole, "socialist", because the collectives, without the necessary industrial base, will inevitably produce Kulaks from their midst. To represent complete collectivization on the basis of peasant stock as socialism means to revive the Bucharinist theory of the Kulak growing into socialism, only in an adminstratively masked and therefore a still more malignant form.

We are for industrialization and collectivization. We are against bureaucratic charlatanry against reactionary Utopias in their openly Thermidorian as well as in their masked Centrist form. Where is the ground here for a bloc with the Right?

But we are also against the distorted, arbitrary, unprincipled, bureaucratic purely Stalinist methods of punishment of the Right because we want a **general delimitation along the whole Party line**, and not apparatus chicanery, exile, and the noose. It is precisely for this general delimitation that we need, above all democracy. Where is the ground here for a bloc with the Right?

But if it should appear—which is not the case—that there is a tactical coincidence or an episodic crossing of the two differing, irreconcilably hostile strategical lines, would that bring nearer the lines themselves? When at the conference of 1907, Lenin voted with the Mensheviks—against **all** the Bolsheviks, including, it is understood Stalin too—for participation in the Third Duma, did that bring Lenin closer to the Mensheviks?

Finally, are the disputed questions exhausted by the tempo of industrialization and collectivization in the coming year? What a sorry administrative-national limitedness! We Marxists do not construct socialism in a single country, like Stalin and Bucharin. We stand on the position of international socialism. Where is our common ground with the Right?

What the Right Wing Thinks

The American organization of the Right wing (Lovestone and Co.) recently declared in a resolution of principles that with the Comintern that is, with Stalin and Molotov, they have only tactical differences, but with the Left Opposition—not only tactical but also programmatic differences. This is absolutely correct. The Brandlerites in Germany, who constantly defend the economic policy of Stalin-Bucharin against us as the only possible one have the same position. Or perhaps, the Workers and Peasants Partyites in France, who voted for the resolution of the Sixth Congress are closer to us than to the official policy of the Comintern, which they supported against us until yesterday? The Right Opposition in Czecho-Slovakia establishes its solidarity in all basic questions with the Brandlerites, and declares the Left Opposition to be a "caricature of the Comintern" that is, a worse edition.

All these Right wing organizations stand on the ground of the present **program of the Comintern**, elaborated by Stalin and Bucharin that is, the Centrists and the Rights. We reject this program because on the most basic points it betrays Marxism and Bolshevism. It is a program of national socialism and not Marxian internationlism, out of which it tears the scientific and practical basis by its theory of socialism in one country. On the question of colonial revolutions and the role of the bourgeoisie in them, this program elucidates the treacherous policy which was conducted in China by the bloc of Stalin and Bucharin, including also their alliance with Chiang Kai-Shek. Under the treacherous slogan of **"democratic dictatorship"** in opposition to the **dictatorship of the proletariat**, the program of the Comintern is preparing new defeats for the young proletariat of the colonies. For this program the bloc of the center and the Right is responsible. This bloc cannot be called the "August" bloc, because it did not endure for one or two months, as in 1913, but for eight years (1923-1930) and even after the formal semi-break still survives in the most authoritative document: **in the program of the Comintern.** And these people, who have squandered their basic Marxist principles in unprincipled machinations, have the audacity to speak of our bloc with the Right!

Stalin-Bucharin and the Chinese Revolution

A LETTER BY TCHEN DU HSIU

(Continued from Last Issue)

But the reasons given by the present Central Committee for expelling me from the Party are:

1. They said: "Fundamentally, he is not sincere in recognizing his own mistake in the opportunist leadership of the period of the great Chinese revolution, and has not decided to recognize where is his real past error, so that he must inevitably continue his past erroneous line." In reality, I was expelled because I sincerely recognized where the error of the former opportunist leadership lay, and decided to oppose the present and future continuation of wrong lines.

2. They said: "He is not satisfied with the decisions of the Communist International. He is fundamentally unwilling to come to Moscow to be trained by the International." I have been trained enough by the Communist International. Formerly, I made many mistakes because I took the opinions of the Third International. Now I am expelled because I am not satisfied with those opinions.

3. Last August 5, I wrote a letter to the Central Committee in which there were the following sentences: "Besides, what is the fundamental contradiction between the economic class interests of these two classes? Before and after the Canton uprising, I wrote several letters to the Central Committee pointing out that the ruling power of the Kuo Min Tang would not collapse as quickly as you estimated. At present, though, there are some mass struggles it is not enough to take them as the symptoms of the coming revolutionary wave." "The general legal movement, of course, is to give up the attempt at revolution. But under certain circumstances, when it is necessary to develop our power, 'all possible legal measures, without a burning character' (Lenin) should also not be given up in this (the transition) period." The Central Committee changed these sentences to read ambiguously: "There is no contradiction between the bourgeoisie and the feudal forces. The present ruling class is not going to be overthrown and the revolutionary struggle is not beginning to revive but to decline more and more. He advocates the adoption of legal forms." Furthermore, they put a quotation mark around each sentence so as to make them seem like my original statement. This is another reason for my expulsion.

The Need for Democratic Slogans

4. I wrote another letter to the Central Committee on October 10 saying: "The present period is not a period of the revolutionary wave, but a period of counter-revolution. We should elaborate democratic slogans as our general ones. For instance, besides the eight hour day demand, the confiscation of land, we should issue the slogans 'Nullify the unequal treaties,' 'Against the military dictatorship of the Kuo Min Tang,' 'Summon the National Congress,' etc., etc. It is necessary to make the broad masses active under these democratic slogans; then we can shake the counter-revolutionary regime, go forwards to the revolutionary wave, and make our fundamental slogans 'Down with the Kuo Min Tang government,' 'Establish the Soviet regime,' etc., the slogans of action in the mass movement.

On October 26, comrade Peng Shu Chi and I wrote a letter to the C. C. saying: "This is not the transitional period to direct revolution, and we must have general political slogans adapted to this period; then we can win the masses. The workers and peasants Soviet is merely the propaganda slogan at present. If we take the struggle to organize Soviets as a slogan of action, we will certainly get no response from the proletariat." But the C. C. stated that we substitute for the slogans "Down with the Kuo Min Tang government" and "Establish the Soviet regime" the present general political slogan of "Summon the National Congress". This is also one of the reasons for my removal.

5. I said in a letter that we should point out "the policy of treason or spoliation of the country by the Kuo Min Tang in the Chinese Eastern Railway", making the "broad masses still imbued with nationalist spirit able to sympathize with us and oppose the maneuver of the imperialists to attack the Soviet Union by utilizing the Kuo Min Tang and making the Chinese Eastern Railway problem an excuse." This was to help the slogan of defense for the U. S. S. R. penetrate the masses. But the C. C. said I wanted to issue the slogan of opposing the spoliation of the country by the Kuo Min Tang in place of the slogan of supporting the U. S. S. R. That is another reason why I was expelled.

6. I wrote the C. C. several letters dealing with the serious political problems within the Party. The C. C. kept them from the Party for a long time. Further, the delegate of the Comintern and the C. C. told me plainly that the principle is that different political opinions cannot be pronounced in the Party. Because there is no hope of correcting the mistakes of the Central Committee by means of a legal comradely discussion, I should not be bound by the ordinary discipline of the organization, and it is not necessary to prevent comrades from passing my letters to others for reading. This is also one of the reasons why I am expelled.

The Correctness of Trotsky's Views

7. Since the "August 7" conference, the C. C. has not permitted me to participate in any meetings, nor has it given me any work to do. Still, on October 6, (only forty days before my expulsion), they suddenly wrote me a letter saying: "The C. C. has decided to ask you to undertake the work of editing in the C. C. under the political line of the Party, and to write an article 'Against the Opposition' within a week." As I had criticized the Central Committee more than once for continuing the line of opportunism and putschism, they tried to create some excuse for expulsion. Now I have recognized fundamentally that comrade Trotsky's views are identical with Marxism and Leninism. How would I be able to write false words, contrary to my opinions?

8. We know that comrade Trotsky has decisively opposed the opportunist policy of Stalin and Bucharin. We cannot listen to the rumors of the Stalin clique and believe that comrade Trotsky, who created the October revolution hand in hand with Lenin, really is a counter-revolutionist (it may be "proved" by the rumors created about us by the Chinese Stalinist clique, Lee Li-San, etc.) Because we spoke of Trotsky as a comrade, the Central Committee accused us of "having already left the revolution, left the proletariat and gone over to the counter-revolution", and expelled us from the Party.

(To Be Continued)

Doonping, or, the Stalin School Orientalist Speaks Up

By JOSEPH CARTER

Once again the noted scholar Doonping tries his hand at "Trotsky-killing" in the current issue of the **Communist.** While ostensibly discussing the present events in China in relation to the Comintern's policy there, he devotes most of his time to a ruthless (!) attack on comrade Trotsky and the standpoint of the Left Opposition. But to what avail? Has he not informed us that "the revolutionary proletariat and oppressed masses in the colonies can only laugh at the embarrassment and doomed fate of the these renegades"? (**Communist,** March, 1930) Or is he merely trying to develop the sense of humor of the colonial oppressed? Be that as it may.

Some of the points raised have already been taken up in the **Militant** in a reply to Doonping's previous article. I will therefore limit myself to some of the more outstanding arguments presented.

As to the characterization of the present period in China and the stage of the revolutionary movement Doonping repeats the Stalinist fable about 70,000,000 workers, peasants and soldiers being under Soviet rule in China, led by the Chinese Communist Party. He does not explain or mention the "if this is true" of Stalin, or why the official Party press is compelled to quote the capitalist press in Shanghai on the activities of the peasants in China, that is, activities which the Communist Party, is supposed to be leading: Added to this is the unique statement that "the struggle of the proletariat is no longer lagging behind the forward march of the agrarian revolution." This light-hearted exaggeration is one of the greatest barriers for a real awakening of the revolutionary spirit of the Chinese proletariat by the Communist Party.

* * * *

Comrade Trotsky, immediately following the Sixth Congress of the Comintern wrote a letter to a comrade in this connection (**Militant**—3-15-1929, "Some Remarks on the Sixth Congress"). There Trotsky speaks of the necessity of transitional demands which would correspond to the objective situation, the "Stolypin period of Chiang Kai-Shek", in order to arouse the masses in preparation for the organization of Soviets and the proletarian dictatorship. Doonping gets excited about Trotsky's characterization of the period as the "Stolypin period of Chiang Kai-Shek". This is interpreted as a belief in a long democratic period for China, as "liquidationism," etc. Anyone who understands even the broad outlines of Trotsky's theory of Permanent Revolution (even Doonping's confused notions of it might suffice!) and its application to the problems of the Chinese Revolution knows how false and intentionally dishonest such an interpretation is. The meaning of Trotsky's phrase is obvious. Just as the period following the defeats of the Russian Revolution of 1905 was characterized by a depression in the revolutionary mood of the workers and peasants; a period of reaction to which the Bolsheviks, led by Lenin, adapted themselves by raising democratic slogans, fighting for immediate economic interests of the workers, consolidating their forces and preparing the ground for the proletarian revolution,—so it is with the period following the Chinese revolution of 1925-27. The **duration** of the "Stolypin period," and even certain of its economic characteristics are obviously not **identical** when applied to conditions and relation of forces as different as those in Russia after 1905 and China after 1927. To be sure, Doonping is not entirely unaware of this simple fact; but he is cautious enough to omit any acknowledgment of it.

* * * *

Doonping even mistakes the official position of the Comintern as expressed both in its activities in China since 1925 and in the colonial theses adopted at the Sixth World Congress. Instead of the activities of the Communists in the colonies being divided into two stages (struggle for a "bourgeois-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry" and then a proletarian dictatorship) as Doonping would have us believe, the Comintern held that there should be **three** stages. The two mentioned above were preceded both theoretically i. e., on paper, and practically, by a joint national revolutionary struggle of all "anti-imperialist classes" (i. e. the bourgeoisie, the urban petty bourgeoisie, the peasantry and the proletariat, united into one national organization) (the Kuo Min Tang) which was supposed to struggle against foreign imperialism and for a **people's government.** For example, the Enlarged Executive Committee meeting of the Comintern in February-March 1926 stated in its resolution on China:

"The Canton government, which is the vanguard in the liberation struggle of the Chinese people, **serves as a model** for the future revolutionary-democratic order of the whole country. The Communist Party and the Kuo Min Tang should help in every way to extend the work of democratizing on the lines of the Canton government, freedom of speech, press, assembly, etc." organizing democratic local organs in the various localities, into agrarian reforms. (**Imprecor,** Vol. VI No. 40 p. 648). Doonping very carefully omits this and is thereby able to accuse Trotsky of having "democratic illusions", of being a "liquidationist" and playing the game of the Left Kuo Min Tang! The Stalinists are trying to forget that period of the Chinese Revolution! But their programmatic and strategical position, as elaborated in the Program and Colonial Theses of the Sixth Congress, basically condones such policies and thereby makes possilbe or rather, inevitable, debacles in India, Latin America, etc. This in spite of the "Left" **tactical** changes in India today.

Doonping poses the quintessential question: "What is the difference between the democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry and the dictatorship of the proletariat if the proletariat plays the leading role in both? And after "proving" how the Opposition confuses the question by speaking of the "democratic dictatorship" as bourgeois democracy, Doonping adds:

"The dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry differs from the dictatorship of the proletariat in the same way as the bourgeois-democratic revolution differs from the proletarian dictatorship"! Here is breath-taking profundity for you! An ordinary polemic seems futile against it, until the next sentence is read:

"Just as there are no 'pure' types in the revolutionary process, there is neither 'pure' democratic-dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry nor 'pure' dictatorship of the proletariat. Whether a government is the one or the other depends upon **the relative share of the proletariat, peasantry and city poor in the power of the state,** as well as the predominant characteristics of the socio-economic policies of the state which are concrete expressions of the stage the revolution has reached." (Our emphasis, J. C.). In the "democratic-dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry" of Doonping, the proletariat is to have the hegemony, which means that the first distinction (emphasized in the quotation) is done away with, therefore the real difference must apparently lie in the second, that is, "the predominant characteristics of the socio-economic policies." In other words, since the socio-economic content is anti-feudal, (bourgeois democratic), the regime will have to be a democratic-dictatorship. Then what were "the socio-economic policies" of the state in Russia following the October revolution? It executed the tasks of the "democratic revolution" in the agrarian revolution, workers' control, etc. Then why was it a proletarian revolution? In other words, the Comintern superficially calls for the same kind of revolutionary government in China as came into existence in October 1917 in Russia. Yet in one case, it is called the democratic dictatorship, while in the other, the proletarian dictatorship! Doonping does not answer this question and thereby gives no reply to his own rhetorical question mentioned above.

* * * *

However, the quotation above gives him away. For does it not mean that the "democratic-dictatorship" is a form of government where the "relative share . . . in the power of the state" of the proletariat is unfavorable as compared to the "peasantry and city poor" (read urban petty bourgeoisie, J. C.)? That is precisely the point! The "democratic dictatorship" in real life means either a proletarian dictatorship or "revolutionary" Wuhan government, a Kerensky regime. And this is why today after the October revolution, after the experiences in China—1925-27 the slogan of democratic-dictatorship must be rejected. It leaves the door open for workers' and peasants' parties," for integral unity with the petty bourgeoisie of the "Left" Kuo Min Tang for the establishment of another "Wuhan government", or even worse traps for the proletariat.

* * * *

However for China the question has special significance. The interconnection between the gentry and the city capitalists, the intricate relation between the usurer, —who is one of the chief exploiters of the poor peasantry—and the town and city, the relation between the rich peasantry (kulak) and the poor peasantry the intimate economic and political relations between the native bourgeoisie and foreign capital, make the character of even the first stage of the revolution, anti-bourgeois, i. e. socialist, as well as anti-feudal. That is the agrarian revolution and the democratic revolution in the cities, cannot be carried out without at the same time encroaching on bourgeois property rights. The Comintern leadership, which even as late as the Sixth Congress laughed at the idea of a "kulak question" in China now calls for leadership of the "poor and middle peasants" (as a matter of fact the latter form an insignificant part of the peasantry) instead of its previous slogan of the struggle of the "whole peasantry" in the revolution. The Canton uprising of December 1927 was a direct proof of the contention of the Left Opposition; the proletariat in face of the Comintern's official standpoint, was immediately compelled to make inroads on bourgeois property rights.

Doonping repeats the wisdom borrowed by Stalin-Kuusinen from Kamenev in 1917 about the democratic revolution "'peacefully growing into" the proletarian dictatorship. How this is to take place neither Stalin, Kuusinen nor, to drop a few pegs, Doonping tells us. All we are told is that it will not be a "violent revolution", that there will be "a continuity of 'government'" with a "gradual progressive shifting of the class forces" (p. 1025.) And all this is handed out as Marxism, as Leninism! It runs directly counter to the Marxist view of the role of the state in a revolution; it is almost word for word a repetition of the phrase-mongerings of the "Left" Social Democracy. Even a casual perusual of Lenin's "State and Revolution" should make this clear even to a Doonping! A peaceful growing over of the "bourgeois democratic revolution," characterized by its anti-feudal social content, to a socialist phase can only take place as two stages of the **proletarian dictatorship.**

Nevertheless let us see how and when this "growing into" is scheduled to take place. The colonial theses states:

"As in all colonies and semi-colonies, so also in China, the development of productive forces and the socialization of labor stands at a comparatively low level. This circumstance, together with the fact of foreign domination and also the presence of powerful relics of feudalism and pre-capitalist relations, determines the character of the immediate stage of the revolutionary movement of these countries. In the revolutionary movement of these countries we have to deal with the bourgeois democratic revolution, i. e., of the stage signifying the preparation of the prerequisites for the proletarian dictatorship and socialist revolution."

In other words, the present stage is to be a prolonged one, for surely it would take some time for such "minimum prerequisites" for a proletarian dictatorship to develop. This paraphrasing of Kautsky Plechanov, Martov, and Co., about the "absence of minimum prerequisites for a proletarian dictatorship and socialist revolution," is a result of the logic of the Stalin-Buchaarin theory of national socialism that is, state power should be taken by the proletariat only where it has the possibilities of developing a complete national socialist economy (where it has "the material prequisites for the building of socialism"). We can reply to such arguments in the same manner as Lenin answered the pseudo-Marxists of 1917: Since **the entire world** has the material prerequisites for socialism (as Kautsky had already stated in 1909, in his "Path to Power") the question is not whether an individual country is ripe for socialism, but rather this: Are the conditions present for the leadership of the peasantry by the proletariat so as to make the revolution in that country a link in the chain of the **world proletarian revolution?** ("The Proletarian Revolution and Kautsky the Renegade," Lenin.)

At the Sixth Congress the confusion wrought by the Comintern's theories and policies on the colonial question was especially reflected in the discussion on the question of the socalled "growing into". Neumann—who at the time of the Canton uprising saw in it the ending of the "bourgeois-democratic" and the beginning of the proletarian revolution, that is, the actual "growing into"—stated that the "mutation" ("growing over") is a question of the relation of forces; is "decided by the struggle." A number of other speakers expressed similar views. This is obviously a repudiation of the "minimum prerequisite" theory. Kuusinen, the author of the colonial theses, polemized against the latter and reiterated the formulation of the theses.

Since then little progress has been made in clarifying the question; on the contrary more confusion has been injected by the "Left" turn after the Sixth Congress. For example an editorial in **Pravda** stated: "Changsha under the Soviet rule means the **proletarian revolution in South China** has captured its first big town"! (Our emphasis, J. C., quoted in **Daily Worker**—8-16-30. What does Doonping think of the slogan in the October 12th statement of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party: "Long live the **socialist** revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasants of China"! (My emphasis. —J, C. (**Daily Worker**—12-2-30). To us this is but an added sign of the confusionist and bankrupt position of the Comintern. And even after Doonping's article under consideration appeared, peculiarly enough, confusion still exists!

However, nothing seems to deter Doonping! He continues to make logical (!) the illogical; shatters the illusions and false views of the reader! "It is sometimes erroneously assumed that there can only be Soviets in a proletarian revolution" and then he adds that this is wrong because Lenin spoke about the propaganda for the idea of Soviets for the East as early as the Second Congress of the Comintern. Perfect! What happened in 1926-27 to Lenin's advice on China? In May 1927, that is, seven years after Lenin's speech, the Plenum of the E. C. C. I., in its decision on China stated: " . . . With the development of the revolution, when it begins to change from a democratic into a socialist revolution it will be necessary to set up Soviets of Workers', Peasants' and Soldiers' deputies, (as) the slogan of the Party". And the Stalinist specialist on China at that time commented: "The proposal to organize Soviets sounds very Left Wing. In the tenth year of existence of the Proletarian Republic we cannot regard the Soviets merely (!) as a form of organization and mobilization of the masses. The Soviets live in the eyes of humanity as an **incarnation of proletarian dictatorship.** The organization of Soviets can be advocated only when it is a question of undertaking the revolution, under the leadership of the proletariat, with the purpose of establishing a new proletarian government. Otherwise, to advocate Soviets is merely playing with words or deception pure and simple." ("War—the Communist International Position," by A. J. Bennett.)

"It is sometimes erroneousiy assumed"! We are literally at a loss for words. And by whom has this erroneous assumption been made? It was made by the Comintern spokesman of an earlier "period". And not by Bennett alone, but by the sacrosanct Stalin himself, to saying nothing of the official theses of the C. I. To quote Bennett, then, we would say that not only Doonping but also his teachers in the international Stalinist apparatus, are either "playing with words or deception pure and simple." They are adept att both.

o—o—o

MOLOTOV ON THE SKIDS?

Elsewhere in this issue, we indicate that the scapegoat for Stalin's ultra-Left swing, as soon as he prepares to shift to the Right, will be Molotov. The subsequent removal of Rykov, and his replacement by Molotov, would seem to invalidate this prediction. But only superficially. Molotov has been removed as one of the Party secretaries, and as head of the Comintern, and invested with what has become a more or less formal post. It should be remembered that Rykov and Syrzov both occupied the place Molotov was just given. And look at them today!

In the Amalgamated

A Worker on Hillmanism

JUSTICE FOR ORGANIZED WORKERS, by Louis Kirshbaum, Post Office Box 200 Station A., Brooklyn N. Y.

In simple narrative form the writer of this booklet, a rank and file member of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union gives an account of his experiences with the officialdom of the union, of the conditions in the shops of the policies of the organization and the existing regime that makes the maintenance of these conditions and the continuation of these policies possible.

The facts dealt with in this book are not of the out-of-the-ordinary type with which the membership of the A. C. W. is not familiar. If such facts as are mentioned in the book were recorded by every member of this union they would fill volumes. But just for that very reason, they are of importance and significance The average member of such unions as the A. C. W. has been accustomed to the rotten actions, and practices of his officials that his sense of justice has ben dulled or atrophied and he endures them indifferently without protest. This condition is in a great measure responsible for the persistence of the evils in the trade union movement, and for that matter in all labor organizations.

A Ten Year Struggle

The writer of this booklet appears before the reader as a brave fighter for justice and a defender of the elementary rights of the rank and file in the trade union organization. For a period of ten years he carries on his struggle against the A. C. W. officialdom and their treacherous policies. The struggle starts with a minor official of a Brooklyn local for his arbitrary settlement of a grievance in the shop where the writer was employed whereby the workers suffered a loss of from ten to fifteen dollars a week; it expands to the higher offices until it involves the entire machine of the A. C. W. administration, including the socalled impartial machinery and the Unemployment Insurance offices, the official press of the union, and even the general press. All these struggles are carried on in a legalistic manner on a constitutional union basis and with the writer as the participant and victim. In the end he suffers a crushing defeat. He is summarily suspended and deprived of all chances to continue his fight within the organization.

The facts brought out in this fight present to us a picture of the most rotten type of a reactionary union, steeped in graft and corruption functioning in the interests of the bosses and the fat boys of the "machine", demoralizing the workers and ruining their lives. Graft and corruption permeate the organization from the very bottom to the very top, from the "inner circle" of the favorite supporters of the local "machine" to the highest offices of the union and the "impartial" chairman. It is a vicious ring of conspirators and betrayers of the clothing workers in which the officials of the A. C. W. and the bosses are linked through numerous offices and institutions: an intricate network in which the interests of the officials and bosses are closely interwoven and where the workers are entrapped and mercilessly exploited. The official is the boss, the union the administrator, the judge and the executioner and from his arbitrary rule there is no redress and no escape as long as the worker is in the industry.

But all this is done not in the open and in public but under the cover of "progressiveness", "militancy" "realism" and by a fine system of organized publicity that is deceiving not only the outside world but even the membership of the A. C. W. which makes the fight against it the more difficult and complicated. It is worth while mentioning here the vulgar phrase "company union", so frequently heard from the lips of the official Communists to denote the A. C. W. The A C W is a thousand times worse than a company union but just because of that more harmful and the methods to be used against it are therefore also more complicated.

The booklet of Louis Kirschbaum is a most valuable contribution in this respect. It helps tear off the mask of the conspirators and traitors and gives the lie to the hypocrites and pen prostitutes in the liberal and "progressive" ranks among whom we find so prominent a personage as the editor of the official organ of the A. C. W., **The Advance.**

However, in spite of the great merits of the book for which we recommend it to every worker, it contains ideas and notions that are confusing and misleading. These ideas and notions are partly due to the liberal ideology of the writer which bursts through every line of the book and partly to his ignorance of the general labor movement.

False Remedies

The writer lays too much stress on the differences between the immigrant unions and the unions of "native Americans" which are more imaginary than real, and he overlooks the specific conditions in the industry that are of economic origin. Likewise, the writer in spite of his rich experience in the A. C. W., which should have taught him the proper lessons in regard to methods to overcome the evils against which he is fighting, arrives at false conclusions and suggests remedies whose adoption without a correspondly radical change in the policies and leadership, would just help to perpetuate these evils by thickening the mask and complicating the system of deceit which the A. C. W. has so carefully elaborated, and to which his own failures are largely attributable.

The writer sharply criticizes the extremists and philosophers contending that they are blind to facts. But the facts he cites in his little book have been known to the "extremists" long before the writer came into contact with them, and it is on the basis of these facts that their theories were formed. while the writer after a decade of sruggle and study emerged as confused and ignorant in regard to solutions as the average worker who is not class conscious. His vague liberal ideology inclines him in the direction of parliamentary and legal reforms which are always used as a cover for false economic foundations. He fails to see the roots of the evils ravaging the labor movement. These roots lie on an economic plane and not on a parliamentary one. A true militant union, based on class struggle policies is the only guarantee for justice for organized workers. A leadership that truly represents such policies will not resort to methods used by a reactionary bureaucracy. Methods must correspond to aims, and the aims of a trade union organization, which are its bases are economic.

The author suggests a series of remedies of a constitutional nature, forgetting that he himself fell victim to these constitutional by-laws, because they were either used against him or disregarded in cases where they could be used in his favor. If all the suggestions of the writer were adopted the "machine" would be greatly strengthened and the struggle more complicated. If "impartial" chairmen can be bribed and lawyers "neutralized" and courts "influenced", as the author clearly shows in the book in what degree would the cause of justice be enhanced through a multiplication of laws courts, judges and other paraphernalia of class rule? It is clear that the cause of justice would be harmed in the degree that these laws, courts etc. were increased, **so long as the foundations of the union remained untouched, because graft, corruption and deceit would increase.**

The author, however, is thoroughly consistent in his line. His suggestions are no mere slip but an elaborate system of reforms of a purely political character which to be realized, must be completely torn away from a class basis. He suggests, for example, as one of his major remedies the creation of an Industrial Forum for impartial investigation of the truth about the aims and methods of the labor movement. Does the author seriously think that the betrayers of labor like Hillman Green or Woll would participate in such forums? Would the "impartial" chairman and commercial lawyers become pure idealists?

The Fantasy of a Forum

The writer complains pathetically that there is no means of learning the truth at present because of the absence of such a forum. Does not the writer thereby admit that he has not learned the truth in spite of his experience or that he also wants Hillman and his conspirators to learn the truth, or perhaps to expose the truth about themselves to others? Surely, he does not mean that. Whom he possibly has in mind in connection with a Forum is individuals in the labor movement who are not connected with union offices. But does he presume that these individuals are at present not seeking and investigating the truth and doing all in their power to spread it?

There is one suggestion by the author which might be constructive and that is his appeal to the individuals of **all** groups in the labor movement belonging to different political schools to unite in questions where the cause of justice is involved. But this suggestion is made as a mere gesture to please some radicals. The author's eyes are turned in the direction of "pure" impartial men and women who have no philosophical theories to prejudice them and whose sole purpose in the movement is to serve justice, seeing the guarantee for it in constitutional by-laws.

The practical remedies proposed in the book, being of an idealistic or abstract nature are not only worthless but even harmful to a degree, because they are misleading. Some of them could at best be of some use only as **secondary** demands or slogans and then only on condition that they are subordinated to the **major** aims, but not as remedies for the evils against which the author is conducting his struggle. These evils can be removed only by an organized struggle of the class conscious workers guided by revolutionary trade union principles. If justice for organized workers is to become a fact the workers must strive not for constitutional or paper guarantees but for real control of their unions for the reorganization of their economic foundations.

Notwithstanding all the defects of the book we recommend it to our readers.

—ALBERT ORLAND

ATTENTION!

Members of the Communist League and its sympathizers who have received the Christmas ten cent coupons are urgently requested to send in their collections to the national office as fast as possible.

All branches of the League are asked to put the Christmas campaign on the agenda of their next meeting. Find out through a roll call how many members received the coupons, and how many remitted to the national office. Those who have not sent in their collections should account at the branch meeting. Those who have not received any coupons should make contributions. The national office is working under great handicaps and every individual member is personally responsible for deficiencies in the administrative work. Each member must take it upon himself and herself to make the Christmas campaign a financial success so that the necessary improvements can be made at the center which will enable us to function more efficiently by increasing the staff. No organization can function properly without the necessary staff at the center. At present we have only one member on the staff. This is an intolerable condition, and must immediately be remedied. It is up to each individual member. We must each take upon ourselves the personal responsibility and the duty to make the urgent improvement without further delay.

Collect on the Christmas campaign and send your collections to the national office or through your branch secretary at once.

o—o—o

HOW STALIN PROTECTED THE BLOOD OF BUCHARIN

In his concluding remarks to the Fourteenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, (1925) Stalin declared in answer to the Left critics of Bucharin and the Right wing:

"Are these facts known to the Opposition? Of course they are. Why, then, do not these comrades cease raising a clamor against comrade Bucharin? How much longer are they going on with their talk about comrade Bucharin's mistake?"

I know the mistakes that certain comrades made for instance, in October (November) 1917, and they are so great that the mistakes of comrade Bucharin are hardly worth speaking of in comparison. These comrades did not merely go astray at that time but they had the 'impudence' to infringe on two occasions extremely important resolutions of the Central Committee, resolutions adopted under Lenin's leadership and in his presence. Nevertheless, the Party condoned these errors as soon as the comrades in question admitted their mistakes. In comparison with the comrades of whom I am speaking, comrade Bucharin's mistake was a trifle. He did not infringe any resolution of the Central Committee. Why, then, all this indignation against Bucharin? What do they really want of Bucharin? They are out for his blood ! That is what comrade Zinoviev demands when, in his concluding words, he returns to the Bucharin question with so much acrimony. You want Bucharin's blood? Well, you won't get it." (Applause).

"So much for comrade Bucharin's mistake."

Belgian Group Splits

For more than a year, the development of the Belgian Opposition has been seriously held back by a serious crisis. The disputes were already distinguishable during the confict around the Chinese Eastern railway, in connection with which the Executive Bureau adopted a position which was rejected by the International Opposition.

For some time the workers grouped around the Charleroi Federation of the Opposition demanded of the leadership "a militant Communist struggle which has not as its objective to destroy on an international scale the official Communist Parties and the Communist International, but to lead them back, under the pressure of the just criticism of the Opposition and the pressure of the revolutionary workers, to a really Communist policy by readmitting the Left Opposition into the Comintern."

They vigorously attacked the policy of the leadership and of Van Overstraeten, and fought their deviations which, by their unstable and temporizing attitude, drew the Opposition on to the path of a second Party set it up in reality against the Comintern, renounced in fact the policy of the united front with the Communist workers, abandoned the revolutionary defense of the U. S. S. R., and suppored the anti-Communist "pure syndicalists". The false policy of the Executive Bureau was based on the refusal to take a genuine and clear position and the Soviet Union. One of the results of the work of redressing the International on this course was the alienation of the Executive from the workers in the ranks, the development of what was becoming a purely national base, so far as relations with the rest of the International Opposition were concerned.

This false policy led not only to stagnation but to the constant decline of the Belgian Opposition which, at the time of its foundation, grouped together the elements of a serious political development. In the eyes of the Belgian workers, it distorted the countenance of the Opposition which should appear to them as the healthiest and most active force in the Communist movement.

The open discussion between the E. B. at Brussels and the Charleroi Federation took place in the columns of the central organ, **Le Communiste,** for a number of weeks. In the discussion, it became clear that the Executive Bureau had only deepened the wrong lines in its course. In the trade union question, it adopted the false position of the "autonomists"; in the question of perspective, it proposed to drive for the constitution of a second party; in the question of the character of the Soviet State its position was very little distinguishable from that of Urbahns and the ultra-Leftists: in its attitude towards the International Opposition, it adopted the position of a very cold, distant cousin. The discussion led to the meeting of the Central Committee at Brussels, where a delegate from the International Bureau was present and supported the position adopted by the Charleroi Federation which was identical with that of the International Opposition.

It was clear during the meeting that the discussion could produce no more results. The Charleroi comrades demanded the convocation of a Congress for the entire organization to be called upon to express itself. The leaders of the E. B. opposed this alleging that the position had already been taken. This refusal consummated the rupture.

The Brussels leaders have made clear their opposition to the work of Communist redressment of the International Opposition. can only lead them, as it did to their progenitors, Urbahns and Paz, to extinction or to an anti-Communist orientation.

The Belgian Left Opposition, under the vigorous impetus of the Charleroi Federation will now be able to take up the huge tasks before it in the ranks of the Belgian workers, betrayed by the social democracy and poorly served by the small clique of Stalinists around Jacquemotte. The most active elements of the Opposition at Brussels, Gand, Verviers, Malines Anvers and Liege, will rally to its ranks. Our International Bureau has decided to support it in achieving its aims and conducting its work. The clarification of aim and perspective in Belgium will lead, as it did in France and Germany, to the advancement of the movement.